



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/630,162

07/30/2003

Irena Hudis

13768.429

7646

47973 7590 11/10/2009
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2437

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/10/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/630,162	Applicant(s) HUDIS ET AL.	
	Examiner JEFFREY D. POPHAM	Art Unit 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-28, 34 and 36-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-28, 34 and 36-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Remarks

Claims 24-28, 34, and 36-45 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 24-28, 34, and 36-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 24, 34, 40-43, and 45 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 24 recites "adjusting data properties of each of the items", however no such data properties are discussed in the application. Claim 26 clarifies this to labeling each item with a zone enumeration, however, the scope of "data properties" in claim 24 is unclear. Claim 34 has the same issue.
- Claim 34 and claims dependent therefrom (40-43 and 45) interchange use of "administrative rights" and "rights". It is unclear whether these are supposed to be different rights, or if they are the same rights, just referred to in different manners. As an example, the end of the preamble of claim 34 refers to "administrative rights", while the end of the final limitation of claim 34 has been amended to remove the word "administrative" before "rights".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24-28, 34, and 36-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glasser (U.S. Patent 6,061,684) in view of Nowicki (U.S. Patent 7,146,377).

Regarding Claim 24,

Glasser discloses in a computer system, the computer system including system memory, a processor, and a computer-readable medium, a data store and a method store being stored on the computer-readable medium, the data store and method store arranged together in a combined item hierarchy on the computer-readable medium, the data store having at least one data item that depends from a method in the method store and the method store having at least one method that depends from data in the data store, the combined item hierarchy being divided into one or more non-overlapping security zones, each of the one or more non-overlapping security zones being defined as a grouping of one or more data items and one or more method items having common

security rules such that principals with rights to items in a non-overlapping security zone can treat all items in the non-overlapping security zone uniformly in accordance with common security rules, a method of splitting the one or more non-overlapping security zones into a plurality of non-overlapping security zones to facilitate more efficient assignment of rights to principals, comprising:

An act of identifying a grouping of data items and method items in the combined item hierarchy (Figure 4; and Column 4, lines 20-35; showing that the hierarchical file system includes files, wherein the files are data files, program files, or other computer information files. Hereafter, any time data and method items are referenced with respect to Glasser, this citation is pertinent, but will not be identified in each instance, in order to provide clear reference to pertinent citations) for which new common security rules are to be enforced, the identified grouping of data items and method items currently included in an existing non-overlapping zone from among the one or more non-overlapping zones, existing common security rules being enforced within the existing non-overlapping zone, the new common security rules differing from the existing common security rules being enforced within the existing non-overlapping zone (Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 27-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25; a resource is selected, wherein the resource will be given different rules than the

resource's parent (where the parent has an ACL that is inherited by the selected resource) and, likewise, the rest of the resources that inherit the ACL of the parent. The change to rights will include providing the selected resource with a new ACL, which will be propagated and inherited by resources descending from the selected resource);

An act of the processor re-configuring the one or more non-overlapping security zones so that rights can be assigned at a granularity that is finer than an entire database yet coarse enough so as to not require assignment for each item, including:

An act of splitting the existing non-overlapping security zone into a new non-overlapping security zone and a remnant of the existing non-overlapping security zone, the arrangement of the new non-overlapping security zone relative to the remnant of the existing non-overlapping security zone based on the location of the identified grouping of data items and method items within the combined item hierarchy, the new non-overlapping security zone for containing the identified grouping of data items and method items, the remnant of the existing non-overlapping security zone containing at least one data item or method item from the existing non-overlapping security zone, wherein the splitting is restricted in such a way as to prevent overlapping

between security zones and such that none of the data items and method items are included in more than one security zone (Figure 4; Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 27-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25);

For any principals that had existing rights in the existing non-overlapping security zone based on the existing common security rules being enforced in the existing non-overlapping security zone at the time the existing non-overlapping security zone was split, an act of retaining those existing rights in the new non-overlapping security zone, including in the identified grouping of data items and method items, subsequent to splitting the existing non-overlapping security zone and subsequent to adjusting data properties to represent that the identified grouping of data items and method items are contained in the new non-overlapping security zone (Figures 4-5; Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 27-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25; in the case of adding a user to the ACL, the previous entities listed in the ACL (the ACL inherited from the ascendant in this case) will still have access, as that previously inherited ACL is copied and then changes are made, such as adding users. The new user is additionally provided with access to the resource and any resources that inherit the ACL of this resource); and

An act of granting one or more other rights in the new non-overlapping security zone to one or more additional principals in accordance with the new common security rules, assigning the other rights to the new non-overlapping security zone collectively granting the other rights to each item in the identified grouping of data items and method items through the assignment of the other rights to the new non-overlapping security zone, the other rights differing from the existing rights (Figures 4-5; Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 27-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25; in the case of adding a user, this new user is provided with rights to the resource and any resources that inherit the ACL of this selected resource).

But does not appear to explicitly disclose adjusting data properties of each of the items in the identified grouping of data items and method items to represent that the identified grouping of data items and method items are contained in the new non-overlapping security zone.

Nowicki, however, discloses adjusting data properties of each of the items in the identified grouping of data items and method items to represent that the identified grouping of data items and method items are contained in the new non-overlapping security zone (Figures 5 and 7; Column 8, lines 25-54; and Column 9, lines 1-9; changing partition identifiers and/or directory identifiers,

for example, to indicate that the item is in a specific/new partition or directory); and

That each non-overlapping security zone can contain both method and data items (Column 3, line 61 to Column 4, line 3; Column 6, line 48 to Column 7, line 10; and Column 12, lines 26-36; showing resources being data and method items, placing a slower process in a partition/zone dedicated to slower processes, and that each partition may include both data and method items). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the partitioning techniques of Nowicki into the access control system of Glasser in order to allow the system to dynamically arrange and rearrange items stored in a file hierarchy in such a manner that they can be moved to a partition dedicated to the particular type of item and the partitions can be merged in the case that multiple partitions are to have the same policies, and/or to allow for explicit designation within a file handle for each file/item as to which partition and directory the file/item currently resides.

Regarding Claim 34,

Claim 34 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 24 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 25,

Glasser as modified by Nowicki discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Glasser discloses that specifying the one or more additional principals is performed by the one or more main principals (Column 7, lines 41-54; the user is verified as having appropriate permissions for the resource(s)).

Regarding Claim 38,

Claim 38 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 25 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 26,

Glasser as modified by Nowicki discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Nowicki discloses that the act of adjusting data properties of each of the items in the identified grouping of data items and method items comprises labeling each of the items with a security zone enumeration corresponding to the new non-overlapping security zone (Figures 5 and 7; Column 8, lines 25-54; and Column 9, lines 1-9; partition and/or directory identifiers).

Regarding Claim 39,

Claim 39 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 26 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 27,

Glasser as modified by Nowicki discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Glasser discloses the rights being security rights (Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 10-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25).

Regarding Claim 40,

Claim 40 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 27 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 28,

Glasser as modified by Nowicki discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Glasser discloses the rights being auditing rights (Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 10-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25).

Regarding Claim 41,

Claim 41 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 28 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 36,

Glasser as modified by Nowicki discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Glasser discloses that the existing common security rules comprise an ACL defining the rights a principal has to the items in the remnant of the existing non-overlapping security

Art Unit: 2437

zone (Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 10-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25).

Regarding Claim 42,

Claim 42 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 36 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 37,

Glasser as modified by Nowicki discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Glasser discloses that the new common security rules comprise an ACL defining the rights a principal has to the items in the new non-overlapping security zone (Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 10-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25).

Regarding Claim 43,

Claim 43 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 37 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 44,

Glasser as modified by Nowicki discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Glasser discloses that the act of granting other rights in the new non-overlapping security zone to one or more additional principals in accordance with the new common security rules comprises an act of granting a set of rights in the

Art Unit: 2437

non-overlapping security zone to the one or more additional principals so as to collectively grant the set of rights to the one or more additional principals for each item in the new non-overlapping security zone, the set of rights including one or more rights selected from among read, write, delete, and execute (Column 7, lines 41-64; Column 8, lines 10-39; and Column 8, line 55 to Column 9, line 25).

Regarding Claim 45,

Claim 45 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 44 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

Art Unit: 2437

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY D. POPHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner

Art Unit: 2437

Art Unit 2437

/Jeffrey D Popham/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437